

June 13, 2020

**The United States District Court for
the Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street, New York, New York 10007**

Quincy Magee
141 N. Wilton St
Philadelphia, PA 19139

vs.

The Walt Disney Company
500 S Buena Vista St
Burbank CA 91521

ENDORSEMENT: My Order of 6/11/2020 (ECF No. 44) was not intended to prohibit Plaintiff from calling the Pro Se Intake Unit. Plaintiff may contact the Pro Se Intake Unit by email or telephone. Plaintiff's motions for sanctions and default judgment (ECF Nos. 22 & 23) were referred to me yesterday by Judge Nathan and will be decided in due course. SO ORDERED.
Dated: 6/16/2020

**Letter
19CV10274**



It is not appropriate for Judge Aaron to order Quincy Magee to not contact the court by phone as he stated in the June 11 Order. Document 44. It should be noted that in that order, he again amended the April 28 Scheduling Order.

As a Pro Se Litigant Quincy Magee is entitled to speak with the Pro Se Intake unit via phone in regards to the timely filing of his documents and to follow up with the clerks office or the ECF Help Desk as needed to manage the process of his case. During the scheduling conference he was directed to file his documents via email to Temporary Pro Se Filing@nysd.uscourts.gov, due to remote work. His documents filed June 6th and June 10th have yet to be added to the docket, as of June 12.

Judge Nathan rules state:

“E. By Pro Se Parties. Pro se parties are encouraged to (1) consent to electronic service (via ECF or email); or (2) seek the Court’s permission to file documents through the ECF system or by email to the Court. Unless the Court grants permission to file documents electronically, all communications with the Court by a pro se party must be mailed to the Pro Se Intake Unit, Thurgood Marshall Courthouse, 40 Centre Street, Room 105, New York, New York 10007. Any questions should be directed to the Pro Se Intake Unit at (212) 805-0175.”

These rules require Quincy Magee to contact the court via phone if he has questions and send his documents to the court via email.

1. How are your instructions consistent with Judge Nathan’s rules?
2. Why has the court not ruled on Quincy Magee’s Motion for Sanctions considering it was filed before the Motion for Stay of Discovery and it is non dispositive?

Quincy Magee requests to have his Motion for Sanctions considered immediately.

Attached is Quincy Magee request for electronic filing and email confirmation documents he filed where were not added to the docket as of June 12, 2020.